

REMARKS

Claims 1-68 are rejected. Claims 1-68 remain pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the remarks set forth below.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 39-40 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bick, U.S. Patent No. 6,924,789 (hereinafter Bick).

CLAIMS 39-40 and 43

Applicants respectfully assert that Bick does not teach subject matter recited in independent Claim 39. For instance, Independent Claim 39 recites in part:

a capacitive sensor that is coupled to said keymat and said keypad structure, wherein said capacitive sensor is integrated within said keymat.

According to the Federal Circuit, “[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each claim under consideration” (W.L. Gore & Assocs. v. Garlock Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

In the current Office Action, the Examiner makes reference to Bick in supporting the grounds of rejection. However, Applicants respectfully assert that Bick teaches a capacitive sensor 19 that is positioned below a keymat 17 (see Figs. 3 and 4; col. 2, lines 51-53). Moreover, at columns 2 lines 35-column 3 lines 29, Bick clearly shows a number of layers disposed below keymat 17 including second optical adhesive layer 27, sensor 19, third optical adhesive layer 28, electroluminescent layer 29, dome adhesive gasket 30 and flexible substrate 31.

Since Bick fails to teach the capacitive sensor integrated within the keymat as recited in Independent Claim 39, but instead teaches a capacitive sensor and a number of other layers below a keymat 17, Applicants respectfully contend that Bick cannot anticipate Claim 39. Therefore, Applicants respectfully state that Bick is missing an

essential element for a prima facie anticipation as claimed in Independent Claim 39 and as such the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is improper and should be reversed.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit the “capacitive sensor is integrated within said keymat” words of the claim must be given their plain meaning. In other words, they must be read as they would be interpreted by those of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Sneed*, 710 F.2d 1544, 218 USPQ 385 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, the integrated terminology is clearly defined in the Specification and the Figures and should be interpreted accordingly. For this further reason, Applicants respectfully state that Bick is missing an essential element for a prima facie anticipation as claimed in Independent Claim 39 and as such the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is overcome.

Furthermore, since Claims 40 and 43 depend from Independent Claim 39, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 40 and 43 derive patentability at least therefrom.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bick. Claims 1-4, 13-15, 21, 25, 26, 44-46, 55-59, 67 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bick in view of Seely et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,188,391 (hereinafter Seely). Claims 5-12, 16-20, 22-24, 47-54 and 60-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bick and Seely as applied to Claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 39, 44, 45 and 58, and further in view of Kleinhans et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,664,489 (hereinafter Kleinhans). Claims 27-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bick in view of Seely and Kleinhans.

CLAIM 41

Applicants respectfully assert that Bick fails to teach or suggest subject matter recited within Claim 41.

Applicants respectfully contend, for the reasons provided herein, that Bick does not teach or render obvious the integrated keymat of Claim 39. As such, Applicants

respectfully submit that Bick does not teach or render obvious the claimed feature of Claim 41 which is dependent on an allowable Independent Claim 39.

For this reason, Applicants respectfully state that Bick is missing an essential element for a prima facie obviousness as claimed in Independent Claim 39 and as such the rejection of Claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is overcome. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 41 is allowable.

CLAIMS 1-4 and 13

Applicants respectfully contend that Bick and Seely et al., alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the substantially transparent single sheet capacitive sensor integrated within the keymat as recited in Independent Claim 1. For the same reasons that Bick does not teach or render obvious the capacitive sensor integrated within said keymat of Claim 39, Applicants respectfully submit that Bick in combination with Seely et al. does not teach or render obvious the claimed features of Independent Claim 1.

For this reason, Applicants respectfully state that Bick and Seely et al. are missing an essential element for a prima facie obviousness as claimed in Independent Claim 1 and as such the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is overcome.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Bick and Seely, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest subject matter recited within Independent Claim 1. For instance, Independent Claim 1 recites in part:

a substantially transparent single sheet capacitive sensor, said substantially transparent single sheet capacitive sensor configured to be disposed within said keypad assembly without requiring the formation of key post holes therethrough, said substantially transparent single sheet capacitive sensor is coupled to a keymat and a keypad structure, said substantially transparent single sheet capacitive sensor integrated within said keymat;

Applicants respectfully contend that Bick and Seely, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the substantially transparent single sheet capacitive sensor

integrated within the keymat as recited in Independent Claim 1. Since Bick and Seely, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one element recited in Independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully contend that Independent Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Bick and Seely. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claim 1 is allowable over Bick and Seely.

Also, since Claims 2-4 and 13 depend from Independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 2-4 and 13 derive patentability at least therefrom.

CLAIMS 14, 15, 21, 25 and 26

Applicants respectfully contend that Bick and Seely et al., alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the substantially transparent single sheet capacitive sensor integrated within the keymat as recited in Independent Claim 14. For the same reasons that Bick does not teach or render obvious the capacitive sensor integrated within said keymat of Claim 39, Applicants respectfully submit that Bick in combination with Seely et al. does not teach or render obvious the claimed features of Independent Claim 14.

For this reason, Applicants respectfully state that Bick and Seely et al. are missing an essential element for a *prima facie* obviousness as claimed in Independent Claim 14.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully contend that Bick and Seely, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest subject matter recited within Independent Claim 14. For instance, Independent Claim 14 recites in part:

wherein said capacitive sensing device is coupled to a keymat and a keypad structure, said capacitive sensing device integrated within said keymat.

Applicants respectfully contend that Bick and Seely, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the capacitive sensing device integrated within the keymat as recited in Independent Claim 14. Since Bick and Seely, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one element recited in Independent Claim 14, Applicants respectfully

contend that Independent Claim 14 is not rendered obvious by Bick and Seely. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claim 14 is allowable over Bick and Seely.

Additionally, since Claims 15, 21, 25 and 26 depend from Independent Claim 14, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 15, 21, 25 and 26 derive patentability at least therefrom.

CLAIMS 44-46 and 55-57

Applicants respectfully assert that Bick and Seely, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest subject matter recited within Independent Claim 39. For instance, Independent Claim 39 recites in part:

a capacitive sensor that is coupled to said keymat and said keypad structure, wherein said capacitive sensor integrated within said keymat.

For the reasons previously presented herein, Applicants respectfully contend that Bick and Seely, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the capacitive sensor integrated within the keymat as recited in Independent Claim 39. Since Bick and Seely, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one element recited in Independent Claim 39, Applicants respectfully contend that Independent Claim 39 is not rendered obvious by Bick and Seely. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claim 39 is allowable over Bick and Seely.

Moreover, since Claims 44-46 and 55-57 depend from Independent Claim 39, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 44-46 and 55-57 derive patentability at least therefrom.

CLAIMS 58, 59, 67 and 68

Applicants respectfully contend that Bick and Seely et al., alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the substantially transparent single sheet capacitive sensor integrated within the keymat as recited in Independent Claim 58. For the same reasons that Bick does not teach or render obvious the capacitive sensor integrated within said keymat of Claim 39, Applicants respectfully submit that Bick in

combination with Seely et al. does not teach or render obvious the claimed features of Independent Claim 58 (emphasis added).

For this reason, Applicants respectfully state that Bick and Seely et al. are missing an essential element for a prima facie obviousness as claimed in Independent Claim 58 and as such the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is overcome.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Bick and Seely, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest subject matter recited within Independent Claim 58. For instance, Independent Claim 58 recites in part:

wherein said capacitive sensing device is coupled to a keymat and a keypad structure, said capacitive sensing device integrated within said keymat.

Applicants respectfully contend that Bick and Seely, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the capacitive sensor integrated within the keymat as recited in Independent Claim 58. Since Bick and Seely, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one element recited in Independent Claim 58, Applicants respectfully contend that Independent Claim 58 is not rendered obvious by Bick and Seely. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claim 58 is allowable over Bick and Seely.

Furthermore, since Claims 59, 67 and 68 depend from Independent Claim 58, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 59, 67 and 68 derive patentability at least therefrom.

CLAIMS 5-12

Applicants respectfully assert that Bick, Seely and Kleinhans, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest subject matter recited within Independent Claim 1. For instance, Independent Claim 1 recites in part:

a substantially transparent single sheet capacitive sensor, said substantially transparent single sheet capacitive sensor configured to be disposed within said keypad assembly without requiring the formation of key post holes therethrough, said substantially transparent single sheet capacitive sensor is coupled to a keymat and a keypad structure, said substantially transparent single sheet capacitive sensor integrated within said keymat;

Applicants respectfully contend that Bick, Seely and Kleinhans, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the substantially transparent single sheet capacitive sensor integrated within the keymat as recited in Independent Claim 1. Since Bick, Seely and Kleinhans, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one element recited in Independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully contend that Independent Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Bick, Seely and Kleinhans. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claim 1 is allowable over Bick, Seely and Kleinhans.

Additionally, since Claims 5-12 depend from Independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 5-12 derive patentability at least therefrom.

CLAIMS 16-20 and 22-24

Applicants respectfully contend that Bick, Seely and Kleinhans, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest subject matter recited within Independent Claim 14. For instance, Independent Claim 14 recites in part:

wherein said capacitive sensing device is coupled to a keymat and a keypad structure, said capacitive sensing device integrated within said keymat.

Applicants respectfully contend that Bick, Seely and Kleinhans, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the capacitive sensing device integrated within the keymat as recited in Independent Claim 14. Since Bick, Seely and Kleinhans, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one element recited in Independent Claim 14, Applicants respectfully contend that Independent Claim 14 is not rendered obvious by Bick, Seely and Kleinhans. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claim 14 is allowable over Bick, Seely and Kleinhans.

Furthermore, since Claims 16-20 and 22-24 depend from Independent Claim 14, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 16-20 and 22-24 derive patentability at least therefrom.

CLAIMS 47-54

Applicants respectfully assert that Bick, Seely and Kleinhans, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest subject matter recited within Independent Claim 39. For instance, Independent Claim 39 recites in part (emphasis added):

a capacitive sensor that is coupled to said keymat and said keypad structure, wherein said capacitive sensor integrated within said keymat.

For the reasons previously presented herein, Applicants respectfully contend that Bick, Seely and Kleinhans, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the capacitive sensor integrated within the keymat as recited in Independent Claim 39. Since Bick, Seely and Kleinhans, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one element recited in Independent Claim 39, Applicants respectfully contend that Independent Claim 39 is not rendered obvious by Bick, Seely and Kleinhans. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claim 39 is allowable over Bick, Seely and Kleinhans.

Moreover, since Claims 47-54 depend from Independent Claim 39, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 47-54 derive patentability at least therefrom.

CLAIMS 60-66

Applicants respectfully assert that Bick, Seely and Kleinhans, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest subject matter recited within Independent Claim 58. For instance, Independent Claim 58 recites in part:

wherein said capacitive sensing device is coupled to a keymat and a keypad structure, said capacitive sensing device integrated within said keymat.

Applicants respectfully contend that Bick, Seely and Kleinhans, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the capacitive sensor integrated within the keymat as recited in Independent Claim 58. Since Bick, Seely and Kleinhans, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one element recited in Independent Claim 58, Applicants respectfully contend that Independent Claim 58 is not rendered obvious by Bick, Seely and Kleinhans. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claim 58 is allowable over Bick, Seely and Kleinhans.

Furthermore, since Claims 60-66 depend from Independent Claim 58, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 60-66 derive patentability at least therefrom.

CLAIMS 27-38

Applicants respectfully contend that Bick and Seely et al., alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the substantially transparent single sheet capacitive sensor integrated within the keymat as recited in Independent Claim 27. For the same reasons that Bick does not teach or render obvious the capacitive sensor integrated within said keymat of Claim 39, Applicants respectfully submit that Bick in combination with Seely et al. does not teach or render obvious the claimed features of Independent Claim 27.

For this reason, Applicants respectfully state that Bick and Seely et al. are missing an essential element for a prima facie obviousness as claimed in Independent Claim 27 and as such the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is overcome.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Bick, Seely and Kleinhans, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest subject matter recited within Independent Claim 27. For instance, Independent Claim 27 recites in part:

wherein said capacitive sensing device is coupled to a keymat and a keypad structure, said capacitive sensing device integrated within said keymat.

Applicants respectfully contend that Bick, Seely and Kleinhans, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the capacitive sensor integrated within the keymat as recited in Independent Claim 27. Since Bick, Seely and Kleinhans, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one element recited in Independent Claim 27, Applicants respectfully contend that Independent Claim 27 is not rendered obvious by Bick, Seely and Kleinhans. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claim 27 is allowable over Bick, Seely and Kleinhans.

Furthermore, since Claims 28-38 depend from Independent Claim 27, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 28-38 derive patentability at least therefrom.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of rejected Claims 1-68.


The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any required fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account Number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 4/2/07



John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

WESTRIDGE BUSINESS PARK
123 WESTRIDGE DRIVE
WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95076
(408) 938-9060